

JUL 23 2007

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030375US1  
Serial No. 10/645,180

## II. REMARKS

1. Claim Status. Claims 14-26 and 28 have been canceled.
2. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101.

The Examiner rejected claims 27-40 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claim 27 to overcome the Examiner's rejection.

3. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103.

The examiner rejected claims 1-13, 27 and 29-40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuli (Patent No. US 6,941,382, hereinafter, "Tuli"). Applicant amended claims 1 and 27 to clarify the distinction that when a user clicks on a fragment of a web page image, and the image contains a segmented hyperlink, then even if the user clicks on a pixel in the fragment other than the segmented hyperlink, the user will be directed to the web page indicated by the hyperlink. Support for the amendment is found in the specification page 9, line 15 to page 10, line 15. The cited portion of the specification is set forth below.

At step 210, WPMP 200 analyzes the web page HTML code and creates a bitmap image similar to the display screen rendering produced by the web page's HTML (210). The image created can also be a .jpg or .gif file. Persons of ordinary skill in the art are aware of other type of image files. As WPMP 200 analyzes the HTML code, WPMP 200 notes the location of the hyperlinks in the code. WPMP 200 records the location of these hyperlinks on the image map for the web page image (212). In other words, WPMP 200 creates a series of segmented images in the same location that the hyperlink would be on the web page. If the user clicks on an image segment, the image map instructs the browser to go to the web page or location indicated by the hyperlink. The image segment can also be mouse sensitive so that when the cursor is moved over the image segment, the user is directed to the new web page or location. The advantage of using segmented images over hyperlinks becomes apparent when the web page image is fragmented in step 218. If the web page was fragmented without the use of segmented images, then the hyperlinks would only direct the user to the linked web page so long as the entire hyperlink was viewable on the image fragment. If

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030375US1  
Serial No. 10/645,180

a hyperlink is fragmented into two pieces, each piece of the hyperlink directs the user to a URL represented by that specific piece of the hyperlink. For example if the hyperlink www.weather.com is fragmented into www.we and ather.com then the user would be directed to the web pages www.we and ather.com respectively, not the desired web page of www.weather.com. If the web pages www.we and ather.com do not exist, the user will receive an error message. In contrast, the present invention creates an image segment that will direct the user to the web page www.weather.com whenever the user clicks on any pixel within the defined image segment, regardless of the fragmentation of the image segment. Thus, the user is able to go to the same location or web page as if he were using a hyperlink. The use of image segments is not visible on the fragmented image and, therefore, not apparent to the user.

Applicant submits that US 6,941,382 (Tuli) does not disclose applicant's invention. Rather, Tuli discloses that the user must click on the part of the image that represents the link. Specifically, Tuli states "... if the user has clicked on a part of the image which represents a link, a new Web page is extracted from the Internet or WWW .... and dispatched to the palm top device where a new page is displayed." (emphasis added) (Tuli 3:25-30). Tuli's language is specific—the user must click on the part of the image which represents the link, and applicant distinguishes on this point alone. In addition, Tuli does not address the situation where a hyperlink is split across two image segments. Tuli merely states that the user can click on the part of the image that represents a link. Thus Tuli refers to a non-segmented link. Therefore, applicant further distinguishes over Tuli because applicant's invention work even when only a portion of the hyperlink is displayed on the image fragment.

4. Applicant submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030375US1  
Serial No. 10/645,180

Respectfully submitted,

*Rudolf O. Siegesmund*

Rudolf O. Siegesmund  
Registration No. 37,720  
Gordon & Rees LLP  
Suite 2800  
2100 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
214-231-4703  
214-461-4053 (fax)  
[rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com](mailto:rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com)

*Page 10 of 10*